

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/540,191 | SALMON ET AL. | |

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| PREETI KUMAR | 1796 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: FAOM

(1) PREETI KUMAR.

(3) _____.

(2) Ilias Lambiris.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 March 2008
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner Kumar contacted Mr. Lambiris regarding a restriction between the method and the composition claims in the pending case. On March 28th. Mr. Lambiris elected by telephone the composition. Subsequently, Examiner was guided to follow 371 Restriction practice that requires lack of a special technical feature. Upon further consideration of the material limitations of the pending claims, the telephonic restriction requirement is withdrawn and all claims are examined in the attached office action.

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Aplicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

